

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are pending. The Office Action dated June 7, 2004 in this Application has been carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are presented in a sincere attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended in this Response. Claim 11-13 have been withdrawn from consideration in a previous Response. Claim 5-8 have been determined by the Examiner to be in condition for the allowance for which Applicants thank the Examiner. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks for those Claims not in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as assertedly having terms that lack a proper antecedent basis. Insofar as it may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are deemed overcome.

Regarding Claim 1, lines 7-8, “the side of the first lamination” and “the side adjacent to the second lamination” have been replaced with “a side of the first lamination” and “a side adjacent to the second lamination,” respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as assertedly having terms that lack a proper antecedent basis be withdrawn and that Claim 1 be allowed.

Claims 2-4 depend on and further limit Claim 1. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of dependent Claims 2-4 also be withdrawn.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as assertedly having terms that lack a proper antecedent basis. Insofar as it may be applied against the Claims, these rejections are deemed overcome.

Regarding Claim 9, lines 7, “the side of the first lamination” and “the side adjacent to the second lamination” have been replaced with “a side of the first lamination” and “a side adjacent to the second lamination,” respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § §112, second paragraph, as assertedly having terms that lack a proper antecedent basis be withdrawn and that Claim 9 be allowed.

Claim 10 depends on and further limits Claim 9. Hence, for at least the aforementioned reasons, these Claims would be deemed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent Claim 10 also be withdrawn.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-10.

Applicant does not believe that any fees are due; however, in the event that any fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 50-0605 of CARR LLP.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  
03DV09062


PATENT APPLICATION  
SERIAL NO. 09/682,277

Should the Examiner require any further clarification to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CARR LLP

Dated: 8-9-04  
CARR LLP  
670 Founder's Square  
900 Jackson Street  
Dallas, Texas 75202  
Telephone: (214) 760-3032  
Fax: (214) 760-3003

  
Theodore F. Shiells  
Reg. No. 31,569